

MAR 29 2006

To: Technology Center 2152  
Facsimile Number: 571.273.8300

Total Pages Sent 6

From: Rodney M. Anderson  
Anderson, Levine, and Lintel  
(fax) 972.664.9606  
(voice) 972.664.9554

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

DuVal et al. (TI-30802)

Conf. No. 7441

Serial No. 09/802,353

Group Art Unit: 2152

Filed: March 9, 2001

Examiner: Refai

For: Wireless Data Transport of Internet Content to Display Device

## CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following papers are being transmitted by  
facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 571.273.8300  
on the date shown below:

  
Rodney M. AndersonMarch 29, 2006  
Date

## FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

☒ **FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**  
☐ NEW APPLICATION  
☐ DECLARATION  
☐ ASSIGNMENT  
☐ FORMAL DRAWINGS  
☐ INFORMAL DRAWINGS  
☐ CONTINUATION APP'N  
☐ DIVISIONAL APP'N

☒ REQUEST FOR  
RECONSIDERATION (5 Pgs)  
☐ EOT  
☐ NOTICE OF APPEAL  
☐ APPEAL

This facsimile is intended only for the use of the address named and contains legally privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this telecopy, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. Applicable privileges are not waived by virtue of the document having been transmitted by Facsimile. Any misdirected facsimiles should be returned to the sender by mail at the address indicated on this cover sheet.

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75074

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 29 2006

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

DuVal et al. (TI-30802)

Conf. No. 7441

Serial No. 09/802,353

Group Art Unit: 2152

Filed: March 9, 2001

Examiner: Refai

For: Wireless Data Transport of Internet Content to Display Device

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This paper is presented in response to the Office Action mailed on December 29, 2005. Reconsideration of this application in light of these remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 24 remain in this case. No claim is amended.

Claims 1 through 11 were rejected under §112, ¶2, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Specifically, claim 1 was rejected as unclear regarding the limitation "wirelessly transmit the content". The Examiner found this limitation unclear regarding to where this content was being transmitted.

Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 rejection of claims 1 through 11, on the grounds that claim 1 clearly recites to where the content is being transmitted. Claim 1 recites that the access device accesses content comprising HTML commands from a network, and that this access devices transmits "the" content (*i.e.*, the content comprising HTML commands). Claim 1